

March 31, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1569

nett's position, and also confirming the 1 percent crime figure.

The greatest headache confronting TA and city police in combating subway crime is the oft-noted attitude of witnesses in refusing to cooperate. There were 10 riders who looked on while young Mormile was being killed. Police were frustrated to the point of despair by the fact that all 10 fled without waiting to give descriptions of the assailants or to volunteer to testify against them.

Without their help, city police rounded up two suspects, teenage Negroes, charged one with homicide and held the other as a material witness.

A television network devoted half an hour last Tuesday to a discussion by psychologists and sociologists on why New Yorkers act that way. They spoke profoundly of fear of reprisal, apathy, a breakdown of social democracy and other overt or hidden motives, but Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy summed it up much more simply. He said New Yorkers simply have an aversion to "getting involved" in anything that does not threaten them personally.

When a New Yorker does go to the aid of a stranger, out of a latent sense of civic duty, or does help capture a lawbreaker, his action rates headlines as a rarity, and not the psychologists, the sociologists or the police commissioner seem to explain satisfactorily why this should be.

IN PHILADELPHIA—A VERY LOUD BARK

PHILADELPHIA.—All's quiet in Philadelphia's subways, thanks to vicious police dogs, specially trained German shepherds on the alert with the uniformed policemen who accompany them. They are patrolling this city's 3 miles of underground concourse, riding 28 miles of track in subway cars, or roaming the various stations.

Their role is to prevent gang wars, to scare off thieves, to rout vandals, and to prevent rapes and other crimes. It was an attack on a 15-year-old Almonesson, N.J., girl by a mob of 17 to 20 hoodlums—while six men stood by and refused to help the girl—that brought the dogs into the subways.

The March 6 assault on the girl aroused public indignation so great that Mayor James H. J. Tate called in his police commissioner, Howard P. Leary, and they instituted several changes in police procedure.

Lt. Joseph F. Larkin, 58, a 23-year police force veteran of some of the toughest beats in the city, was assigned 12 dogs and more than 120 extra men.

He was given orders to keep crime out of the city's three subways, out of the central city concourses. He was promised four more dogs next week and many more just as soon as the animals and their police handlers can complete the 3 months' training it takes.

The canine patrol, which got underway March 10, stopped a potential riot in the Broad Street subway. It broke up a hassle involving 75 youths at the Market Street elevator. It routed a holdup suspect in the city's Locust Street subway.

It scared away much more crime. The dogs work daily from noon until 7 the next morning, the peak hours of crime. With each log there is a policeman.

"There's been a terrific change since we brought in those dogs," Lieutenant Larkin said. "They are doing plenty of good. We've had no rapes, no cashier robberies, no other serious incidents, not even teenage subway vandalism since the K-9 corps went to work."

"Sure, we still find drunks in the subways, id vagrants. But the sex maniacs, the homosexuals, have left their haunts. Like many others, they are afraid of the dogs." All the German shepherds are from 90 to 0 pounds. They are on leash and trained attack only on their handler's orders. They are expert at sniffing out persons hiding

in the dark recesses of the subway stations. Lieutenant Larkin said the public seems much more secure with the dogs than they did before. "Women especially," he said, "show their pleasure. They talk to the handler, even pet the dogs, for the animals—although vicious on command—are gentle under their discipline."

"With good reason," said Lieutenant Larkin. "A gang of kids might jump an armed policeman but they'll refuse to bait a cop with 100 pounds of raging dynamite ready to jump at them."

try to the victors. The appeals for negotiation need to be addressed first to Hanoi, to Peiping and to the Vietcong. There can be negotiation, no doubt, when they wish to negotiate but it is difficult to see how anything can be done as long as the departure of the forces of the United States is made a precondition to settlement.

The United States also is reproached for its failure to delineate its policy to South Vietnam. The reproach might be more aptly stated as a reproach for a policy that is disliked. That policy is to live up to our commitment to the South Vietnamese people, whom we have pledged to support as long as they wish to struggle for their independence and freedom. Those who dislike this policy, and the acknowledged distress and discomfort in which it has involved us, owe the Government, in all candor, an explanation of the alternative policy which they would pursue so that its discomforts may be examined. It is mischievous to simply denounce the situation at which we have arrived, the predicament that we are in and the policy to which we are committed without offering any specific alternative proposals. The essence of policy decision is in having a choice between available courses of action. Let the terms of the alternatives be made known. If there is a better course that this country can pursue with honor surely those in authority would be glad to learn of it.

It ought to be emphasized, however, that there are no time machines available. The events of the past 10 years cannot be extinguished. The future begins tomorrow and not yesterday or on some yesterday 10 years ago on which we might have elected to stay out of South Vietnam. The critics of the policy of the United States can be most helpful by suggesting what ought to be done next instead of proposing what should have been done last year or 10 years ago.

In spite of the accelerating violence of the battle, the primary and legitimate interests of the major powers involved actually do permit a great deal of maneuver. Surely those interests, sooner or later, will assert themselves. The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam. North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable and productive neighbor from which the United States and all other foreign troops had departed. These are not irreconcilable purposes and after more or less destruction of life and property no doubt they will be put upon the negotiating table. It is too bad it could not be sooner rather than later.

A Terrible War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the brutal bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, which has further complicated the difficult task of determining U.S. policy in Vietnam, the Washington Post, this morning shed some useful editorial light on the perspective within which we should view our national dilemma.

Most of us, Mr. Speaker, are very much aware of the inadequacy of the information we have on which to form our judgments of U.S. policy, so we can appreciate the wisdom of the Post's suggestion that to denounce existing policy without being prepared to offer a better alternative is more mischievous than constructive.

I include the Post editorial under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix: [From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 31, 1965]

A TERRIBLE WAR

The shocking terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was hardly needed to demonstrate what a brutal and barbaric struggle is taking place in South Vietnam. That was already well known. Still, we need to note that this barbarous attack upon unarmed men and women, children, civilian employees and bystanders, American and South Vietnamese alike, was made by forces that have been protesting the methods of the South Vietnam troops in battlefield situations.

What is going on in South Vietnam is a war in which every living person is a combatant, in which no man, woman or child has any sanctuary, in which there can be no peace for anyone. It is not surprising that this sort of war can be waged most effectively by those who acknowledge no rules or restraints.

The Government of the United States, as it is frequently advised by many of its own people and by its friends abroad, is in a very disagreeable and difficult situation. Agreement does not extend very far beyond this self-evident conclusion. We know we are in a very difficult predicament. We know how we got there. The numerous advisers who pour their counsel on the Government are not so prolific with suggestions as to how we can alter our situation without incurring risks and inviting dangers as bad or worse.

The Government is advised that it should negotiate—but all the powers with whom it might negotiate have let it be known that they are unwilling to negotiate until the United States withdraws and leaves the coun-

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our late distinguished colleague, Noah Mason, and I took our oaths of office as Members of the House of Representatives for the first time on the same day. Thereafter he and I served together on the same committee for 10 years, until that committee on claims was absorbed by the great Committee on the Judiciary under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act. I was fortunate later to renew my association with him when

March 31, 1965

A1570

I was elected to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker that I served intimately with him over a longer period of time than most, if not all, of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I came to know him well and to respect him deeply. He brought to the committee meetings, and, of course, to this Chamber, a keen and perceptive mind which was a tremendous asset when explaining his strong convictions. While we seldom agreed politically, in the words of our great Speaker of the House of Representatives, he was never disagreeable. And I believe that he felt that I reciprocated in kind. This was typical of the relationship that Noah Mason had with most Members of this House.

This Nation will always require legislators with the stature of Noah Mason regardless of party affiliation. The courage of one's convictions is essential to proper exposition of the legislative problems that face any great nation. Everyone knew exactly where he stood on everything and everyone knew exactly how he voted on difficult issues because he never shirked his obligation to record his convictions. I shall, Mr. Speaker, miss him a great deal as will the Members who value these fine attributes of character in their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I extend to his family my deep sympathy.

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to receive word of the passing from this life of one of our most beloved former colleagues, the Honorable Noah Mason.

I was privileged to serve with Noah Mason in the House for 24 years, and more particularly, it was my rare privilege to work with him perhaps as closely as any Member because of the respective positions which we held on the Committee on Ways and Means as chairman and ranking member for a period of several years.

Mr. Mason was one of the most beloved individuals who ever sat in the House of Representatives. His Welsh humor, his disarming candor, his unquestioned integrity, his high personal standards, his Rock of Gibraltar character were qualities well known and appreciated by all of us. We regretted his decision at the end of the 87th Congress to retire from the House because we realized how his presence in the Committee on Ways and Means and on the floor of the House would be missed from day to day. We did have the privilege of seeing him from time to time and, on rare occasions, he did come back to the Committee on Ways and Means and visit with all of us in committee. We are all

saddened by his death because men of his stature and men of his stamp are few and far between. With the greatest of sincerity, I can say that when I received this sad word, in my mind's eye I began to review the significant contributions which this great man made to his State and his Nation and to the work of this body over the many years of his service here. They are far too numerous to relate on this occasion but I can assure you they were many in quantity and significant in quality. My deepest sympathies go to his wife, children, and other loved ones.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for the splendid job it has done in preparing and reporting to the House this historymaking bill.

It is clear that precedents are being swept aside today, and that the Federal Government is entering an area in a very substantial way insofar as monetary assistance and support are concerned that has heretofore been believed to be principally one for the legitimate function of the several States and local subdivisions of government.

But the desperate conditions in many States and communities make the assistance provided by this bill more or less mandatory upon those interested in strengthening our national school system, broadening the educational opportunities of all our youth and perpetuating the vigor and well being of our American society.

The needs of modern day education are so great and so demanding, so crucial if you will, that truly they can only be met in their entirety on a national basis by the Federal Government by the support and assistance of local and State agencies and functions by the National Government. Wisely and soundly administered as provided by the bill, this aid should not and will not impair basic control of education at local and State levels.

It has been demonstrated in very many ways throughout the Nation that the States and local governments and the subdivisions thereof are no longer able adequately to provide the financial aid imperatively needed to adequately sustain elementary and secondary education throughout the Nation.

I will not allude at length to the problems of illiteracy and subnormality and the plight of the disadvantaged child,

and the grave problems of so many communities that are not able to cope with the ordinary problems of providing a good, sound education for their children, let alone the many extremely challenging problems presented by special groups of children for whom special techniques and opportunities must be provided.

It is unquestionable, to my mind, that the time has arrived, indeed it has passed, when we must come to grips in a practical sense with the essential problem of strengthening our entire educational system, not only in physical terms such as plant and buildings, but in enlisting the best available specialized personnel and modern techniques and the maximum utilization of modern, instructional technology.

In this regard I have always been very much impressed with the sage observations of my friend, the late, very distinguished and esteemed Senator Robert Taft, who declared in substance that while "education is primarily a State function, in the field of education as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

In these few words, Senator Taft, with his discerning mind and acknowledged genius in statecraft, well summarized for us of this generation in short concise terms the scope of the obligation of the Federal Government in basic fields that relate to the education of children and adults and the general well-being and vigor of all our citizens.

It should be noted that these remarks were made more than 10 years ago, and they not only pointed very significantly to areas of compelling need, but outlined and in a sense prophesied in effect, the direction in which this great Nation should and must move, if we are to discharge our full obligation to the people and the children of America. In fact, these words are at once a gleaming blueprint as well as a concise program for political and social action in basic areas in which we are commendably and urgently advancing at this very hour. These noble words are worthy of a great statesman; they are the promise of our future fulfillment.

While the pending measure provides substantial funds for general and special educational purposes, it is not what might be called a broad bill in the sense that it covers the entire field. It is in fact a rather circumscribed bill, since it is designed "to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

Admittedly, it is difficult to arrive at a proper, workable formula that will equitably distribute funds throughout a country as large as ours, but on the whole the Committee has managed to tackle an perform this job in a very creditable manner, and I believe it is practical and can be effectively executed.

I do not propose to argue the case that various conditions of poverty trace back and are directly attributable to lack of educational opportunities, because I believe in my mind and heart that fact